

PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT COUNTIES

Advisory Meeting
September 18, 2002
Sacramento County
Department of Human Assistance
2007 19th Street
Sacramento, California

1. Welcome – Joeana Carpenter greeted everyone.
2. Agenda Review – Joeana went over the agenda items and asked for any additional items.
3. Summary Review – Joeana asked if there were any additions or changes to the summary.
4. Status of Enterprise – Joeana introduced Charlotte Crawford from Visionary Integration Professional, Inc. (VIP). VIP will be developing the Feasibility Study Report (FSR) for moving the data collection and QC data onto a web based application. Charlotte gave some background on VIP. It is located in Folsom and has been in business since 1996. She has been with VIP since 2001 and she has twenty-six years in public service. She served as a Commissioner of Human Services in Nevada. The FSR is a very prescribed process and assists in crafting a case for improving a business need. She indicated that she would be working with the PMC to understand the interface counties have with the data collection system.
5. APHSA Conference – Joeana Carpenter handed out an outline of TANF Reauthorization Work Requirement and Data Reporting. The form outlines the issues relative to work requirements and how they are impacted by the House Resolution 4737 and the Senate Finance Committee Bill. Joeana participated in a conference call with Elaine Ryan from APHSA where it was announced that there would probably be continuing resolutions and the possibility of appropriating funds for six-month periods. The funding for TANF will expire in September 2002, and the High Performance Bonuses will expire in December 2002. As Of September 17th, there has been discussion of some compromise on both the House and Senate bills, and a third bill with common provisions may be what is proposed. Joeana indicated if any one wanted her to explain the outline to give her a call.

Joeana handed out two items from FNS. One deals with the High Performance Bonuses, QC Reform, the New Liability System, State Reporting Requirements, and Calculation of Performance Measures. The second handout illustrates how FNS uses the QC data. The conclusion of this handout indicates that: QC data is widely used; the QC data is used for research and policy-making decisions and it is important that the data be of high quality and be accurate. This point was strongly emphasized by FNS at the recent conference.

“Not only is accurate data critical”, Joeana emphasized “but also timely reporting of the data is crucial as well.” She explained that if we do not submit accurate data on time, FNS can withhold the federal share of county administrative money which is approximately \$241M. That is why we regularly provide feedback on the federal edits/errors at the PMC meetings.

Joeana went further to illustrate the potential negative fiscal impact on the state if the TANF data we submit is inaccurate. There is a \$150M penalty for submitting inaccurate data. In addition, due to inaccurate data (current year) the WPR’s were 7% points lower than they should have been, however due to “clean-up” efforts we have been able to correct those problems. Federal penalties for not meeting the Work Participate Rate (WPR) can be assessed at 5 to 21% of the TANF grant or \$187M to \$784M. So every hour in work/participation activities must be reported accurately; it’s critical. And finally if any state does not meet their WPR’s, their MOE increases from 75% to 80% which is approximately \$187M. These are examples of why accuracy and timeliness are so important. Fortunately we are not in a penalty mode, but we need to be proactive and improve the accuracy of data to avoid any problems in the future.

Joe Pacheco from the Trend Analysis Unit gave some examples of data which is incorrectly entered onto the Q5i, thus negating any analysis and drawing any conclusions about the data field.

6. Food Stamps – Michael Bowman-Jones distributed information regarding EBT. He also indicated that that he would like everyone to read the draft transmittals on the HUD vendor payments and SUA and provide him feedback a week from today.
7. Inquiry Process – Varaniece Hall reported that she is down two staff, and that her unit is trying to respond to inquiries as best they can. She reviews all answers to inquiries and has noticed a few areas that are contributing to the timeliness of the responses. 1) Question/issues are sent to the wrong analyst. 2) The case scenario should be complete. There have been instances where her staff needed to call in order get information which resulted in the situation being changed. She recommends that the inquiry be as detailed as possible and indicate why the case is cited in error. 3) The inquiry must have the proposed response. 4) The inquiry should indicate if the review is a state or federal case, and 5) the regulations and any appropriate ACLs or ACINs citations must be included on the inquiry form. Cases that have been cited in error get priority responses to their inquiries. Evalyn asked if FS program was issuing instructions on HUD payments. Varaniece indicated that they are finishing up on the ACIN and that no errors are to be cited. The feds stated that this is effective May 1, 2002. PMC asked that federal Admin notices be shared via the user e-group. Program had no problem with that, but there would have to be a process to insure program gets the notices as well.

8. Corrective Action – Mark Gagnon indicated that ME's would hopefully begin in October of this year. Twenty-five counties per year are mandated by the feds, and some of areas that will be evaluated are: Program access, payment accuracy, Civil Rights Compliance, and CFAP. The depth of the ME is of limited scope because of staff resources. They will interview the Eligibility Workers to see if they are following procedures. Mark said that the proposed schedule for the ME's is October for the following counties: Solano, San Joaquin, Sacramento, Contra Costa, Fresno, Monterey, and Stanislaus. In addition, For November the following counties: Los Angeles, Tulare, San Diego, Orange, Riverside, Ventura, San Bernardino, and King.
9. Q5i Version 2.0 – Carlos Ocampo demonstrated some of the new features of the next version. He described the new assignment screen, which will let the supervisors assign several cases to different analyst at one time. He also showed the new format for the comments screen. Analyst can now view the comments while in the data screen. He indicated that there are significant changes to the Food Stamp Profile as a result of the data collection changes.
10. Characteristics of Food Stamp Errors – Warren Ghens distributed a list of errors recorded on the Edit All for the period November 2001 through March 2002. Warren said that six edits accounted for 87% of errors in the food stamp cases during this period. He went over each of the edits, edit text, correct coding and the items involved with their definitions and instructions. He stressed that this information be shared with county staff, so that they are aware of the areas which need specific attention when they are entering data.
11. FNS Handbook Chapter 16 Changes – Richard Trujillo went over each item from the latest draft of changes which FNS will require states to report. He indicated that these items will part of the next Q5i version and it is important that the supervisors share the new data requirements with their staff. In this way, they will be familiar with the new data and definitions.
12. Quarterly Reporting/Prospective Budgeting (QRPB) Proposal – Daphne Criswell gave an overview of the proposed QRPB which will replace the current Monthly Reporting Retrospective Budgeting system. The new QR system will apply to all CalWORKs and Food Stamp households with the exception of nonmonthly reporting households in the food stamp program. Recipients will have limited mandatory reporting requirements during a quarter like change of address, income exceeding a specified amount, drug felony convictions and fleeing felon status. The recipients will be required to submit a QR-7 once per quarter, and the eligibility and benefits for a three-month period will be based on information provided on the QR-7 using prospective budgeting rules. Benefits will be frozen for the three months of the quarter except for certain circumstances. Benefits will not be decreased or discontinued during the quarter unless it is a direct result of county action taken due to a change that was required to be reported or recipient request discontinuance. Daphne illustrated some examples for budgeting income and expenses.

13. Regional Reports – Evalyn Epps indicated that the items were covered in this meeting. She wanted to know about the meeting schedule for next year, so that participants could make room reservations. It was suggested that we discuss the schedule at the November meeting.
14. Next Meeting – November 13th at the CDSS Training Center